

M. Pearce
U.S.S.N. 10/055,791
Page 7

REMARKS

The Abstract and specification have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's recommendations. Claims 1-29 have been cancelled without prejudice, and claims 30-47 have been added. No new matter has been added by virtue of the amendments. For instance, support for the new claims appears e.g. at page 6 and the original claims of the application.

It is believed the amendments made herein obviate the objection to the Abstract and the use of trademarks in the specification. The Abstract as amended now has more than 50 words. The trademark usage has been more formalized as recommended. It is believed the detailed discussion and existing usage of integritPC™ at page 6, lines 5-7 of the application is appropriate, i.e. the mark is presented in its customary format and further amendment is not warranted.

Claims 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph on formal grounds, i.e. that claim 12 does not contain proper method format. The rejection is traversed.

Respectfully, claim 12 as presented clearly has appropriate method format and includes manipulation various steps.

In any event, new method claim 30 clearly has appropriate format.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 1-3 and 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over Halperin et al. (U.S. Patent 5,687,717). The rejection is traversed.

Applicant's independent claim 30 reads as follows:

Claim 30. A method for monitoring a patient, comprising:

- a) providing a monitoring system comprising: i) one or more physiological sensory devices; (ii) an electronic module unit to receive data of the one or more sensory devices; and (iii) a computer unit that utilizes an open architecture computing platform for receiving and analysis of data from the module;
- b) providing data to the module unit from the one or more sensory device units providing data to the module unit; and
- c) through a handshaking protocol, transferring data between the module unit and computer unit transferring data, whereby the handshaking protocol ensures reliable data transfer and notification of error.

Applicant's independent system claim 40 recites similar features.

That method and system provides notable advantages. For instance, because the module unit can communicate with an open architecture computer, any of a wide variety of computers may be employed, including various desk lap and laptop computers as discussed at page 6 and elsewhere in the application.

Moreover, by employing a handshaking protocol that can alert a user of any problems with communication between the module and computer, data transfer is significantly facilitated.

The cited Haleperin patent clearly does not disclose or otherwise suggest such a method as Applicant claims. Among other things, in the Haleprin system, the computer is an integrated component of the cart, and the communication bus is tightly controlled. An open architecture system and a handshaking protocol with alarm notification are not employed.

M. Pearce
U.S.S.N. 10/055,791
Page 9

In view thereof, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

It is believed the application is in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter F. Corless (Reg. No. 38,360)
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP
P.O. Box 9169
Boston, MA 02209
Tel: (617) 439-4444
Fax: (617) 439-4170